



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

had to endure in the West India plantations, such as would make your hair stand on end with horror; and he explained to her that what Phelim would have to bear was exactly the same in intensity, and that the only difference was in duration; that the blacks would be slaves for their lives, but that Phelim would only suffer as long as his master pleased. And he assured her that nothing would be so effectual in getting her son quickly out of his troubles as if she employed him to send out a proper memorial to his lordship.

You would have pitied poor Mrs. O'Mahony if you could have seen her face when she heard all this horrible news. She was only too thankful to pay her pound to Mr. Grip, who promised her that if his memorial did not get Phelim out of trouble altogether, it would, at all events, be sure to make his punishment a great deal lighter.

It was with a heavy heart that Mrs. O'Mahony brought home the news to her husband, and with the crying and the hallowing he found it hard enough to make out her story; but when he was made to understand it, he was as much to be pitied as his wife. The first that gave him comfort was Pat Callaghan, who was a shrewd fellow, very hard to humbug, and whom Mr. Grip set down as a great rebel.

"Why, man alive," said he, "what nonsense it is to let a fellow like Grip run down the character of a good landlord. Did anybody ever know his lordship to do anything unhandsome, and would anybody make me believe that after making us all think he had given your son a full pardon, and never saying a word about any more punishment he had to suffer, and after taking him into his service, and giving him the best of treatment, and showing you and him all sorts of kindness, that now that he has taken him off from you he will make a slave of him, and treat him worse than the blacks. I am sure Mr. Grip is the last person that ought to say Phelim had any more punishment to bear after himself making out his pardon for you, and in which it was said that all arrears and remains of punishments were forgiven him. One might be puzzled by Grip's story if he had nothing to gain by it, but when one sees that he wins money out of your fright, and that every one of your wife's tears is a penny in his pocket, then it is not hard to understand why he sets such a story going."

By talking this way Pat got both Mr. O'Mahony and his wife into better spirits. However, it only lasted till two or three weeks afterwards that Mr. Grip said that it would be necessary to send a second memorial: nothing could be heard yet from Jamaica, and it was not likely that one memorial would set Phelim quite free; it had lightened his punishment no doubt, but still more was necessary to make him a free man again. Mr. O'Mahony swore Grip should have no more of his money; but it was no use. Mrs. O'Mahony could not get the picture out of her head of her son being in suffering, while money of their's could release him, and when she fell asleep she would dream that she saw poor Phelim among the blacks, exactly as Grip had described him, and that he was praying and begging of her to get him free; and when she used to wake in a cold sweat from one of these dreams, she used to feel sure that all Grip had told her was true, and she gave her husband no rest till he had paid Grip all that he said was necessary. Poor O'Mahony liked a quiet house, and, besides, he did not feel certain but that what Grip said might be true, and if it was, there was nothing he would have grudged for his son's deliverance.

Grip served much the same tricks on the Sullivan family; but I don't want to tell any more of the heartless way in which he made those poor people's sorrow for their children that had gone from them an engine for screwing money out of them. I hear it has been said for Grip that he didn't invent any of these dodges himself; that the same thing had been done by his father before him, and that this Grip, that is now, had really come to believe in his pardons and memorials, and thought that Lord Kilmarty couldn't stir a step except as he bid him. One would like to be charitable, so I hope this was the case; but whoever invented those things, Grip had the profit of them, and a nice harvest they brought him in.

And I needn't say anything of his tricks on the other tenants—how he went collecting the arrears of rent from them; and when they produced Lord Kilmarty's receipt in full, he said this only was a receipt for the principal rents, but that they had to pay besides arrears of glove money and duty fowls, and agent's perquisites, and goodness knows what besides. More fools they that paid him:—it's my rule, and I recommend it, Mr. Editor to your readers—WHEN YOU HAVE GOT A RECEIPT IN FULL, DON'T LET ANYBODY PERSUADE YOU TO PAY OVER AGAIN.

A few questions about Purgatory.

Does not the Gospel promise complete remission of sins to all true believers in the Lord Jesus? Are we not told that "THE BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST, OUR LORD, CLEANSETH US FROM ALL SIN?"

Do not the priests themselves maintain that they are able, by absolution, to bestow a perfect forgiveness of sins? And do they not profess in Extreme Unction to blot out all remains of sin? What, then, is left to be atoned for in purgatory?

If the priests say that the passion of our Lord only remitted the eternal punishment of sin, and that Christians

have still themselves to pay the temporal punishment of sin, will they be pleased to show us where this distinction between the temporal and eternal punishment of sin is mentioned in the New Testament? The pardon of sin there spoken of is described as absolute, without reserve or limitation, and not a word is mentioned as to any part of sin being unforgiven, or any punishments remaining to be satisfied in purgatory.

Is this doctrine of purgatory honourable to the character of God? What would our readers think of a man who professed to have fully and freely forgiven a debt, and who then should afterwards sue his debtor for a portion of the demand?

Supposing this doctrine of purgatory not to be true, whose interest was it to invent it, and whose interest is it to keep it up? Into whose pockets does the money go that is paid for confessions and at death-beds, and for masses, and month-minds, and how much of this money would be paid if it were not for a belief in purgatory?

HOW ARE WE TO DEAL WITH OUR FRIENDS WHO HAVE BECOME ROMAN CATHOLICS?

In Conversations between two Clergymen of the Church of England, one of whom had seceded to Rome, and there submitted to a second ordination.

CONVERSATION II.

[NOTE.—The Interlocutors are denoted by the letters R and A, which are the initials of *Roma* and *Anglia*.]

R. I have reflected a good deal, dear A., on the subject of our last conversation; and I confess that the more I reflect upon it the more I feel surprised at your absolute rejection of the Catholic doctrine (I beg your pardon, the Roman Catholic doctrine,) of intention. I cannot but conclude, that you have entirely misunderstood that doctrine—you have said that you consider it one of the most vulnerable points in the theology of the Church of Rome. Will you explain yourself more fully, and say, where and how it is vulnerable; for to me it seems almost self-evident. But first let me remark, that I think you mistake St. Thomas, in supposing him to have held your doctrine. I could, I think, satisfy you that he really maintains what you choose to call the ultramontane doctrine.

A. Perhaps he did, although he evidently felt the difficulty of it, and did not state it with the boldness of subsequent writers. But I have not said that St. Thomas held our doctrine. What I said was, that he has very distinctly stated our doctrine.* I understand him to say, in answer to an objection, that the minister of a sacrament acts in the name of the Church Catholic, whose minister he is; and that in the words he utters is expressed the intention of the Church, which is sufficient to the perfection of the sacrament, unless the minister or the recipient, by some external or outward act, or declaration, express the contrary. If this be a correct account of the meaning of St. Thomas, I think it very clearly expresses our doctrine, and is a satisfactory answer to the objection he was considering; and you will observe he says, "Nisi contrarium exterius exprimat,ur," thus distinctly asserting the necessity of an external declaration of an intention opposed to the intention of the Church, in order to invalidate the sacrament. So that, according to St. Thomas, a secret or internal intention, or defect of intention to the same effect, would not invalidate it. I am not, however, I confess, prepared to say, nor do I believe, that even an external declaration would necessarily invalidate the sacrament. The minister who made such a declaration, and, notwithstanding, still continued to minister with avowed dishonesty, would only be committing the greater sin, and I hold that no sin of man can make void the promises of God. But this is not now the question. St. Thomas Aquinas distinctly states, as an opinion to which he inclines, that the minister who uses the offices of the Church thereby expresses the intention of the Church, unless he makes an open external declaration of the contrary; in other words, that no secret intention of the minister can invalidate the sacrament. This, I think, you will admit, is a statement of the doctrine that could scarcely have been made by a modern divine, holding the theology now deemed orthodox at Rome; for I fancy that your Italian theologians, if I may not call them ultramontane, would not be content with such a statement; and that according to them, a secret internal intention, not outwardly expressed in any way, of not doing what Christ had instituted, although all ceremonies, prayers, and forms prescribed by the Church were observed, would invalidate the sacraments.

R. No doubt it would; for he who only pretends to minister, whilst in his heart he really intends not to do what Christ has instituted, is a dissembler, and cannot be deemed to minister a valid sacrament; and so St. Thomas expressly teaches, when he proceeds to show, that although faith be not required in the minister to the perfection of a sacrament, yet that a perverse intention, when that perverse intention implies an intention of not conferring the sacrament, does invalidate it.*

* His words are—"Et ideo alii melius dicunt, quod minister sacramenti agat in persona totius Ecclesie cuius est minister: in verbis autem quæ profert, exprimitur intentio Ecclesie, quæ sufficit ad perfectionem sacramenti, nisi contrarium exterius exprimat,ur ex parte ministri, vel recipientis sacramentum."—*Summa* iii., q. 64-8.

† *Summa* iii., 9, 64, art. 9.

‡ *Ibid.*, art. 10.

In vain, therefore, do you quote St. Thomas as being of your opinion.

A. I do not by any means suppose him to have been of my opinion. On the contrary, I believe him to have been one of those by whose subtlety the contrary opinion was introduced into Christian theology. For it is clear that he himself did not fully teach it, and that it was not the generally received opinion of the Church in his time. Nevertheless, I think he held your doctrine, although he felt its difficulty, and, as I have said, did not state it with the naked boldness of modern Roman divines. For instance, in the very place to which you now refer, he says, indeed, as you allege, that if the minister did not intend to confer a sacrament, but only to do something delusory or in sport, such an intention would invalidate the sacrament; but then he adds, "especially if he should manifest his intention by any external act."† Such an especially would not, I think, be found in any modern advocate of this doctrine; nor can I very well understand it, for if the sacrament be null, I do not see how it can be especially null; there can be no degrees of nullity.

R. You would have made a capital schoolman; but then you give up St. Thomas.

A. I need not give him up; for some of your own authorities, the Jesuit Salmeron* for instance, maintain expressly that Aquinas did not hold the modern doctrine of intention. However, I have no objection to give him up. I never quoted him as being of our side. All I said of him was that on one occasion, in answer to a particular objection, he states our doctrine. I do not undertake to defend his consistency. But I believe he did virtually hold your ultramontane doctrine, inasmuch as he elsewhere expressly states that an intention of the sacramental effect is necessary, although here again he qualifies what he says in a way that no ultramontane divine would now do, by adding that this intention is expressed (he does not say sufficiently expressed) by the words which constitute the form of the sacrament.‡

R. You will call it ultramontane; but I believe it to be now the received doctrine of the whole Church.

A. I suppose it is, as I think, indeed, it ought to be, the received doctrine of the whole Roman communion; those of them at least that adopt the missal of Pius V., with its rubrics, as corrected and set forth under the decree of the Italian Council of Trent. The rubrics which define the defects that may possibly occur in the mass, from the intention of the ministrant, appear to me to teach the extreme doctrine; and I cannot imagine how any one who receives that missal, and believes himself to be bound by it, can honestly hold any other opinion.

R. You are quite right; those rubrics evidently teach our doctrine. But it surprises me that you do not see the absolute necessity and reasonableness of that doctrine; for is not a due intention necessary, even in the laity, for the acceptable worship of God? Can there be any prayer, any effectual or acceptable prayer, that does not proceed from sincerity of heart? Nay, are not the very groanings of the troubled spirit, without words of prayer, accepted with Him, when they are the utterance of faith and love? In other words, the intention of the heart is received by Him, without any sound or external utterance. Must not, therefore, the intention of the minister to confer grace in accordance with the promises of Christ, and not to perform a mere external ceremony, be essential to the acceptable ministration of the sacraments?

A. There is no doubt a certain truth at the foundation of your doctrine of intention, to which it owes its plausibility; for no error exists, or at least no error can exercise much influence in the world, unless it be based upon some truth. That sincerity of purpose, reverence, and a desire of doing God's will is necessary to all acts of worship, is most true; that this is especially true in those who minister in holy things, and that in this sense the intention of administering the sacraments according to the institution of Christ, and for the end which He intended, is the duty of the clergy, we not only admit, but maintain. "The true worshippers," our Lord himself tells us, "must worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him" (John iv., 23); and he adds the reason (ver. 24), "God is a spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit, and in truth." In this sense, we believe intention to be necessary to all acts of acceptable worship as well as to the sacraments. Without it the worshipper must either have a wrong intention, and his worship is a mockery; or he wrongly applies his lip service to God, while his heart is far from Him. This, however, is very different from your doctrine of intention.

R. But our doctrine clearly and necessarily follows from it.

A. By no means. It is the duty of the clergyman, in ministering the sacraments, as in all other acts of worship, to have respect to the spiritual meaning and intent of the act of worship in which he ministers. It is the duty of

* His words are—"Put a cum aliquo non intendit sacramentum conferre, sed deorsum aliquid agere, et talis perversitas tollit veritatem sacramenti, præcipue quando sumus intentionem exterius manifestat."—*Ibid.*

† In Epist. Pauli Lib. 2, Disp. 2.

‡ *Ibid.*, art. 8.—"Et ideo oportet quod [aliquis] determinetur ad unum, i.e. ad sacramentum effectum, per intentionem abundantem; et hæc intentio exprimitur per verba quæ in sacramentis dicuntur; puta cum dicit, Ego te baptizo, &c."

the layman, in receiving any sacrament, or in performing any other act of worship, to receive in the faith of Christ's promises—to worship in spirit and in truth. Neither clergyman nor layman can do otherwise, without a mockery of God—without great and grievous sin. But the sin of the ministering clergy cannot make void the promises of Christ, nor invalidate the sacrament, any more than the sin of the layman, who worships in outward act only, can make void the promise, or invalidate the sacrament. "Yea, let God be true," says the Apostle, "but every man a liar." Faith in the recipient of a sacrament is necessary on his part, and without it his receiving is a sin, enhancing his condemnation; not conferring grace. But the unbelief or the wrong intention of the ministrant cannot deprive the faithful recipient of the benefits of the sacrament, without making void the promises of God. This is what we say and maintain. To minister without intending what Christ intended, or with the intention of anything else, is an act of profanity—of grievous sin on the part of the minister; but this sin does not annul the promises of Christ made to the faithful in the sacrament; because the wickedness of man, however gross, cannot make void the word and promises of Christ. Your doctrine cannot, by any ingenuity of sophistry, be made to follow from this.

R. But where is the great harm of our doctrine? and what are those pernicious consequences which you say must follow from it? To me it appears most useful and salutary, as impressing upon the minds of the clergy the necessity of looking well to their intention and mental devotion in the solemn act of ministration, and so guarding them against what you acknowledge would be in them a grievous sin and profanation.

A. But we must not seek to impress the mind even against sin by the pretence of consequences that are not true. It is not true that defect of intention, or any other sin, not even want of faith, in the ministrant, will hinder the effects of the sacrament, or make void the promises of Christ. Therefore, we cannot consent to teach what is untrue, even though it were demonstrated that it might be occasionally useful, and that a man might be thereby sometimes deterred from a sinful act. It should be enough for the clergy to know that to minister the sacraments with a lip service only is a sin, just as ministering without faith is a sin, and yet your divines admit that want of faith does not invalidate the sacraments;⁵ but, might it not be as fairly said, that to teach the contrary would be useful and salutary, inasmuch as if the clergy were made to believe that the sacraments would be null, without faith in the ministrant, they would be the more impressed with the necessity of ministering with faith?

R. You mistake me. I do not say that this incidental good effect is a reason for teaching the doctrine, if it were not true; what I said was, that our doctrine of intention, so far from having mischievous consequences, as you pretend, appears to me to have only useful and salutary consequences, one of which I mentioned. I should be glad to know what evil consequence can follow from it?

A. I will tell you. This consequence inevitably follows from it: that it is absolutely impossible for you or any other believer in that doctrine to be certain that you have received valid orders, or that any priest or bishop has received valid orders. It is impossible for any Roman Catholic (believing this doctrine) to be certain that he has received, or that anybody else has received, any valid sacrament, inasmuch as he cannot be certain of the secret intention of the minister of that sacrament. For, mark! Your doctrine makes that to be necessary for the essence of a sacrament which, whether it exist or not, cannot, with any certainty, be known. Therefore, you cannot be certain that any given ministration of a sacrament is valid. For instance, you have received the order of the priesthood at the hands of a bishop; it is absolutely impossible to know whether or not that bishop really, in his inmost heart, intended to give you that order; therefore, according to this doctrine, it is impossible for you to know whether or not you are a priest.

R. It is, of course, impossible for me to know the secret intention of another. I cannot read the heart of another; but may I not be certain another way. I am morally certain, from my knowledge of you, that you would not willingly do a dishonest thing. May I not be equally certain, from my knowledge of the bishop's piety and religious character, that he would not be guilty of so gross a profanation of his sacred office.

A. (Smiling). Excuse me, but I cannot avoid smiling, at seeing how curiously extremes meet. This is the express doctrine of our English Puritans, who maintained that the validity of all religious ministrations depends on the sanctity of the ministrant; and this is virtually what you now say, for you derive your certainty of the intention of the minister from his sanctity; therefore, you cannot be certain of the validity of any sacrament ministered by him except so far as you are certain of his sanctity.

R. That is not fair; for your Puritans made the validity of all religious ministrations to depend on the sanctity of the ministrant, whereas I do not such thing. I believe that valid sacraments may be administered even by an unholy ministrant. I only say, in answer to your allegations, that it is not impossible for me, as you assert, to be certain whether I am a priest or not, in consequence of my inability

to discern the secret intention of the bishop who ordained me; and I say that, although I cannot see into his heart, yet I may have moral certainty of the rectitude of his intention in other ways—as, for example, by my knowledge of his character.

A. Well, let us suppose that you have this certainty. Granted that you are certain, by some means or other, of the intention of the bishop who ordained you; this will not make you a whit more certain of the validity of your orders, unless you can also be certain of the intention of the bishop that ordained your ordainer; and then of the intention of the bishop that ordained him, and so on to the last link of the chain. Nor is this all. You must also be certain, if your doctrine of intention be true, that all this long series of bishops were each individual of them validly baptized. For you know it is the doctrine of the canon law,⁶ as well as of the most eminent Roman theologians, that, if a man be promoted to orders unbaptised, his orders are null. Therefore, if any one bishop in this long series, from the bishop who ordained you to the Apostles, should happen to have been baptised by a priest whose intention in that act of baptism was contrary to the intention of the Church, or to the mind of Christ, that bishop was not baptised; therefore his orders were null; therefore the orders of all ordained by him are null; therefore the orders of all the bishops in the series between him and your ordainer, inclusive, are null; and therefore your orders are null. Now, I say, it is absolutely impossible for you to be certain, that in the long series of bishops, extending over nineteen centuries, not one was baptised by a profligate priest, deacon, or layman (for your Roman divines admit laymen to baptise in cases of necessity) who intended to make void the sacrament, or who did not intend what the Church intends. Such is the monstrous confusion and uncertainty introduced by this school doctrine, enough to undermine the faith of all simple Christians, and to make infidels of those who reflect, if they look upon such a tenet as a part of Christianity.

R. I think I may now retort upon you your accusation of adopting Puritan arguments; for this is, exactly, what your Puritans allege against the doctrine of apostolical succession. You never can be certain (say they) of the validity of your orders, because you cannot be certain that every individual in the long series between your ordainers and the Apostles was validly ordained.

A. This will not bring you off. For this Puritan argument takes no account of the ancient canons by which all consecrations of bishops are regulated, and which secure the succession against all possibility of danger arising from the possible, but very improbable, circumstance of an unconsecrated man acting as a bishop in the consecration of another. *The consecration of a bishop is a public, external act, which must be well known to the bishops in communion with him, as well as to the clergy and laity over whom he presides.* And the absence of such consecration must, therefore, be, in all cases, notorious, and easily ascertained; not so the secret intention of the priest or bishop who ministers a sacrament. The Puritan objection against the apostolical succession is, therefore, founded on ignorance of the doctrine and discipline of the Church. But you cannot say this in reply to my objection. Your doctrine of the necessity of the ministrant's intention is not by me mis-stated or misunderstood. That doctrine asserts that the secret intention of an individual, of which no other individual can be cognizant, is necessary to the validity of all sacraments. In baptism, therefore, no living man, except the minister himself, can be certain that he intends what the Church intends, and that the baptism is valid. In ordination, which you suppose to be a sacrament, the ministering bishop may be conscious of a right intention, but still cannot be certain of the validity of his act, because he cannot be certain of his own baptism, and, therefore, cannot be certain, according to your own principles, whether he has received the sacerdotal and episcopal character himself. Hence, it is perfectly clear that no man, who holds your doctrine of intention, can be certain either that he himself or anybody else has received holy orders in the Church of Rome.

(To be continued).

The following announcement will, we doubt not, be very agreeable to certain of our readers:—

"We have heard and believe that there is a good foundation for the statement, that it is the intention of the Executive to bring the great advantages derivable from the reading of wholesome books specially within the reach of one highly important body in this country—the Irish Constabulary. His Excellency and Sir Duncan McGregor feel, we believe, deep anxiety on this head, so much so, indeed, as to contemplate the establishment of small peripatetic libraries at all the Constabulary stations. In the event of this intention being carried into effect—and we hope it may, for a more deserving class of men, or one more prone to profit by literary reading and culture, is not to be met with in the three kingdoms—we are assured that the boon will be highly acceptable to the Constabulary of Ireland, that it will be an advantage to the country, and tend to increase the respect attached to her Majesty's representatives in Ireland."—*Daily Express*.

⁵ Decretal, lib. iii., tit. 43, cap. 1.—"Si quis presbyter ordinatus, deprehenderit se non esse baptizatum, baptizetur et iterum ordinetur;" and see also cap. 2, which is entitled, "Non baptizatus ordinari non potest; et si de facto ordinatus, non recipit ordinis characterem, licet crediderit baptizatum." This is the opinion of that eminent theologian Pope Innocent III., whose writings have had so much influence on modern Roman theology; for this chapter is taken from one of his epistles.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-street. Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber.

We have received letters from Mr. William Rourke, and several other valued correspondents, but are obliged to postpone them in consequence of the great length of Mr. E. Power's letter.

In consequence of several persons having returned copies of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, which had been already paid for by friends, under the apprehension that they might be called on hereafter in person to pay for them, we beg to call their attention to the following announcement—viz., that any one receiving any number of this journal which has not been ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, APRIL 17, 1856.

We believe there are no words dearer to the hearts of Irishmen than civil and religious liberty.

In this free country a man might almost as well say he was not a friend to justice, morality, or truth, as admit that he was not an advocate for civil and religious liberty.

Different men, however, seem to entertain very different ideas of what this glorious liberty really consists in.

The Most Rev. Doctor Cullen has more than once informed us that "wherever the (Roman) Catholic religion prevailed, there *true liberty* followed." What precise signification Doctor Cullen attaches to the phrase *true liberty* we find it difficult to ascertain. It may cover a very large or a very narrow margin; it may mean either perfect and absolute freedom, or merely so much of liberty as he and the priests conceive to be wholesome for their people to enjoy.

We suppose we shall best judge of it by observing the kind of liberty which has actually followed in countries where the Roman Catholic religion has extensively and exclusively prevailed, and the element of Protestant heresy been most effectually excluded.

We have, within the last few years, had, unfortunately, too many instances of the sense in which civil and religious liberty is understood in Roman Catholic countries. We have seen it in Tuscany, in Naples, in Italy, and in Spain, the most (Roman) Catholic country in Europe, where even the dead are not suffered to go to their earthly resting-place with the services of their Church unless they believe in the orthodox creed.

In Spain, which was truly more Romanist than Rome itself, we have little to look back upon but a long dreary night of religious despotism and intolerance, practised by a domineering priesthood and a merciless inquisition, which has done its best to stifle every spark of religious liberty, and has gone so far to crush every rising emotion of independence of thought or action, that the nation which occupies one of the fairest provinces, and inherited the proudest traditions and the noblest descent in Europe, has dwindled down to a state so inferior, that its envoys are no longer summoned to the great congresses and councils of Europe, where the fate of nations is being decided upon, and the balance of power adjusted.

Most of our readers know that Spain, under Charles V. and Philip II. (the husband of our Queen Mary, of persecuting memory), was the most powerful kingdom in all Europe, and her armies the most formidable. Shortly after this a gloomy indolence and a degrading superstition settled over the people like a depressing nightmare; religious tyranny and intolerance, and the most cruel persecution, under the Inquisition, spread their arms over the

⁶ S. Thom. 3, Summum 9, 64, art. 9.